OBSERVATION REPORT #104

Verizon does not meet System Outages notification timeliness established in the Verizon Change Control Notification Process.

Issue

The Verizon CLEC Change Management Notification Process includes the following process flow for System Outages:

- If the System Outage, Severity 1, is not resolved within 20 minutes then a notification will be sent out to the CLECs via email. A Severity 1 relates to connectivity problems.

- If the System Outage, Severity 2, is not resolved within 1 hour then a notification will be sent out to the CLECs via email. A Severity 2 relates to transaction problems.

KPMG Consulting reviewed 166 System Outages starting March 1, 2000 through February 28, 2001. In this review, KPMG Consulting used the information taken directly from the email notification attachments sent by Verizon, the date/time stamps associated with each email, and Verizon's Change Management Notification Process document. According to Verizon's procedures, the interval time begins upon identification of the issue. Verizon does not meet these intervals in a reasonable percentage based on the issue identification time.

KPMG Consulting reviewed the intervals of time for system outages in two ways. The first was to look at the time difference between identification of the problem and the time officially recorded as the notification time within the bulletin (this is Verizon's record of the problem). The second was to compare the identification time to the actual date/time stamp recorded on the email sent to the CLECs (i.e., another record of the actual interval experienced by CLECs). Based on the interval as measured under both scenarios, KPMG Consulting found that Verizon did not consistently meet the interval policy.

For Table 1, KPMG Consulting used the "Initial" bulletins, which were attached to the emails sent to CLECs by Verizon's WCCC (Wholesale Customer Care Center). KPMG Consulting compared the interval between the Date and Time Issued Identified to the Date and Time of bulletin. This difference was compared to the expected intervals for each severity level and recorded appropriately. However, several System Outages (29 of 166) were not able to be compared due to the status of the bulletin, missing information, or documented times did not allow for such calculations. Table 1 below displays all System Outages that did not meet the specified intervals or did not have adequate information for the period beginning October 1, 2000 and ending February 28, 2001.

This observation report is for discussion purposes only and subject to change without notice.

Table 1: Initial Bulletin – Difference in Time between Identification and Notification

Date of System Outage Occurrence	System Outage Number	Assigned Severity Level	Time Difference Between Initial Bulletin Identification and Initial Bulletin Notification	Met Interval?
10/04/2000	85820	1	1:20	No
10/05/2000	87298	1	0:25	No
10/06/2000	88249	1	0:25	No
11/03/2000	109513	2	Not Available	N/A
11/06/2000	111725	1	0:27	No
10/25/2000	101237	1	Not Available	N/A
10/18/2000	97624	1	0:25	No
11/27/2000	126236	1	Not Available	N/A
11/29/2000	131081	1	Not Available	N/A
12/04/2000	132229	2	Not Available	N/A
02/14/2001	188378	2	Not Available	N/A
02/19/2001	191699	2	2:21	No
02/27/2001	198981	1	0:40	No

Summary of System Outage Notifications	
March 1, 2000 – February 28, 2001	
Total Number Met ("Yes")	91
Total Number Not Met ("No")	46
Total Number of Notices Reviewed	137

The overall compliance rate for System Outage Notifications using these criteria was approximately 66% (91 of 137). Of the notifications that were sent past the specified period, they were late by an average of approximately 16 minutes.

For Table 2, KPMG Consulting used the "Initial" bulletins, which were attached to the emails sent to the CLECs by Verizon's WCCC. KPMG Consulting compared the interval between the Date and Time Issue Identified that was listed in the Initial Bulletin to the Date Stamp on the email sent by Verizon WCCC. Bulletins that did not meet the specified intervals were labeled as "No" on the table. A number of System Outages (28 of 166) were not able to be compared due to the status of the bulletin, the lack of certain information, or the documented times did not allow for calculations to be performed. Table 2 illustrate a sample of results for October 1, 2000 through February 28, 2001, for

This observation report is for discussion purposes only and subject to change without notice.

System Outages that did not meet the intervals or for which the analysis could not be performed.

The results using the second set of criteria show a lower overall compliance rate.

Table 2: Date Stamp
Difference in Time between Email Date Stamp and Issue Identification

Date of System Outage Occurrence	System Outage Number	Assigned Severity Level	Time Difference Between Email Sent Time and Issue Identified Time	Met Interval?
10/04/2000	85820	1	1:37	No
10/05/2000	87298	1	0:27	No
10/06/2000	88249	1	0:34	No
10/14/2000	94424	1	0:23	No
11/01/2000	108532	1	0:25	No
11/03/2000	109513	2	Not Available	N/A
11/06/2000	111725	1	0:29	No
10/25/2000	101237	1	Not Available	N/A
10/25/2000	102497	1	Not Available	N/A
10/18/2000	97678	1	Not Available	N/A
10/18/2000	97624	1	Not Available	N/A
10/17/2000	96278	2	Not Available	N/A
11/27/2000	126236	1	Not Available	N/A
11/28/2000	126950	1	0:25	No
11/29/2000	131081	1	Not Available	N/A
02/14/2001	188378	2	Not Available	N/A
02/22/2001	194865	2	1:01	No
02/27/2001	198981	1	0:45	No

Summary of System Outage Notifications		
March 1, 2000 – February 28, 2001		
	Total Number Met ("Yes")	53
	Total Number Not Met ("No")	85
	Total Number of Notices Reviewed	138

The overall compliance rate for System Outage Notifications using the Time Sent criteria for calculation of the interval was 39% (53 of 138). Of the notifications that were sent past the specified period, the communications to CLECs were late by an average of approximately 28 minutes.

This observation report is for discussion purposes only and subject to change without notice.

<u>Assessment</u>

Verizon is not sending out notification within the interval time established by the Change Management Notification Process. Table 1 indicates that, Verizon met the intervals 66% of the time. Table 2 indicates that Verizon met the intervals 39% of the time. CLECs may be unaware of system outages and their severity – impeding CLEC operations.

This observation report is for discussion purposes only and subject to change without notice.